

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 20 are pending in the application. Claim 2 stands objected to due to informalities. Applicants have amended Claim 2 to address this rejection. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,381,202 issued to Shimoda. Claims 5, 7, 11, 13, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoda in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0105874 issued to Matsumoto. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Shimoda discloses comparing common disc type information recorded on a disc with dedicated disc type information read from ROM of an optical drive to determine if the disc manufacturer has changed the recording characteristics of the disc (9:11-28).

Claim 1 recites, in part, “a general write strategy table associated with the optical drive and having plural preassigned optical medium identification codes, each preassigned optical medium identification code associated with one of plural general write strategies.”

Claim 8 recites, in part, “preassigning optical medium identification codes for optical media lacking write strategies for writing information from the optical disc drive to the optical medium.”

Claim 15 recites, in part, “building optical disc drives to recognize the preassigned optical medium identification codes and write information with general write strategies according to the design parameters.”

Shimoda cannot anticipate Claims 1, 8 and 15 because Shimoda fails to teach, disclose or suggest all elements recited by Claims 1, 8 and 15. For example, Shimoda fails to teach, disclose or suggest “a general write strategy table associated with the optical drive and having plural preassigned optical medium identification codes” as recited by Claim 1, “preassigning optical medium identification codes for optical media” as recited by Claim 8, or “building optical disc drives to recognize the preassigned optical medium identification codes and write information with general write strategies according to the design parameters” as recited by Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of

Claims 1, 8 and 15, as well as Claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-20 which depend from Claims 1, 8 and 15 respectively.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on September 28, 2006.

/Robert W. Holland/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W. Holland/

Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020